

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/595,905		BOURGES, BERNARD	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	ERNESTO GARCIA		3679	

All Participants:

(1) ERNESTO GARCIA.

(2) Ms. Susan A. Wolfe.

Date of Interview: 14 January 2010

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 USC 112(2) paragraph rejection

Claims discussed:

14, 15, 22, 25, and 28

Prior art documents discussed:

n/a

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 1:10PM

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner proposed amending the recitation "an elastic conducting means" in claim 14, line 19, as the recitation was invoking 35 USC 112(6) paragraph without setting forth the function. It was agreed that claim 15 be inserted into claim 14 such that claim 14 no longer invokes 35 USC 112(6) paragraph. It was also agreed that the term "metallic" in claim 15 be deleted to broaden the helical spring in claim 14. It was agreed that the term "can bear" in claim 22, line 3, is to be amended to --bears-- and the reference to "elastic conducting means" in claim 22, line 3, be amended to the helical spring. Claim 28 was also discussed as it depends from a cancelled claim 27. It was agreed to make claim 28 depended from claim 14.